

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

MICHAEL WIDMER B-30985,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 12 C 7066
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF)
CORRECTIONS, et al.,)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Pro se plaintiff Michael Widmer ("Widmer") seeks to vent his spleen by asserting unfairness on the part of this Court, which has undertaken numerous efforts to make plain to Widmer the continuing deficiency in his submissions that are essential to this Court's determination under 28 U.S.C. §1915--the precondition to granting him in forma pauperis status. Even though it has been obvious, and this Court's repeated orders have made it plain, that the missing information as to his trust fund account is for the months of March and April, 2012, it does not seem to have occurred to Widmer that he has never advised this Court as to where he was in custody during that two-month time period. If, as his most recent submission has indicated, he has been unsuccessful in obtaining a response from the Illinois Department of Corrections as to his trust fund account transactions during those missing months,¹ this Court would see

¹ This Court has not of course been provided by Widmer with a showing as to the nature of his requests for the omitted

no problem with making its own inquiry in the hope that it might be more successful than Widmer has been.

Meanwhile Widmer is totally wrong in placing blame at this Court's doorstep. It seems plain that he does not recognize that all of this Court's efforts have been aimed at preserving, rather than hindering his ability to assert whatever claims he may have.² In the meantime, despite Widmer's protracted noncompliance, no dismissal of his action will be ordered at this time--but if he fails to provide the information as to where he was in custody status during March and April of this year on or before January 11, 2013, that added level of noncompliance will necessarily be attributed to Widmer himself, so that a dismissal at that point will be called for.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: December 20, 2012

information. Hence it has no knowledge of whether he has asked the right questions or whether he has directed his inquiries to the right place. Accordingly this Court has no way of judging the legitimacy of Widmer's frustration with the ineffectiveness of his requests.

² Once again Widmer is reminded that nothing that this Court has said or done involves any judgment as to the viability or nonviability of his claims.